

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY



0 0000 6208 953

D

411

098

NO. 13

MAIN

EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAENSIS



o. 13

Price 3d. net

THE REFUGEE QUESTION

By JOHN
HOPE SIMPSON



OXFORD PAMPHLETS
ON WORLD AFFAIRS

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON WORLD AFFAIRS

No. 13

11
98
13

THE
REFUGEE QUESTION

BY

JOHN HOPE SIMPSON

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1939

THE refugee question has become increasingly grave in the post-War period. War, nationalism, and racial persecution have combined to drive large numbers of people from the countries in which they lived and worked, and have presented the world with a problem which can no longer be settled by individual charity.

This pamphlet discusses the magnitude of the problem, the methods which have so far been used to deal with it, and suggests future possibilities.

Sir John Hope Simpson, after a distinguished Civil Service career, was Vice-President of the Refugee Settlement Commission in Athens from 1926 to 1930, went on a special mission for the British Government to Palestine in 1930, and was Director-General of the Flood Relief Commission in China from 1931 to 1933. He is the author of a full-length study of the refugee question recently published under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

91/71

Printed in Great Britain and published by
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS *Amen House, E.C.4*
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS
HUMPHREY MILFORD *Publisher to the University*

UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA LIBRARY

THE REFUGEE QUESTION

The 'Refugee'

A 'REFUGEE' might be described as an involuntary migrant. He would rather remain where he is, but conditions religious, economic, political, or social have rendered his life there so uncomfortable or, indeed, so unbearable, that he is forced to migrate from his home and to search for more tolerable conditions of life elsewhere. His alternatives to escape may frequently be the concentration camp or suicide. His search is often rendered more difficult in that the ordinary rights of a national are withdrawn from him, he is denationalized, unprovided with the normal documents of travel, and left to fend for himself unaided by any of the services of the State to which he belonged. He is an unwanted inhabitant of the world, unwanted in the country of his origin, unwanted in any other country.

Movements of Population

Movements of population are a commonplace of history, and even to-day populations are only exceptionally, and possibly only temporarily, static. As a result of these movements the population of every civilized country is composed of persons of mixed race. It is probably true to say that pure 'race' is a mythical conception, notwithstanding intense and bigoted belief to the contrary. For example, the British people are notoriously the product of a mixture of many races, as are also the German people and the Italian, the population of the United States of America, and even of India. The elementary international relations of civilization are

incompatible with that isolation which would be requisite for maintenance of purity of 'race'.¹

Though movements of population are no novelty, the world is faced to-day with those of that particular kind which are described as 'refugee movements'. Even those are no new phenomenon. Throughout history from the time of the flight of the Hebrews from Egypt up to the present century there have been movements of population which may be described as refugee movements. Some of them have had momentous results—none perhaps more momentous and less foreseen than those of the emigration of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1602. This was the migration of a body microscopically small, but a migration of which the ultimate colossal effect is visible in the world to-day. An earlier movement, based also on religious grounds, was that of refugee Flemings and Walloons from the Low Countries into England, and later and more important that of the Huguenots, of whom this country, to its lasting advantage, received some 80,000. Religious intolerance, though a frequent cause of refugee movements, is by no means the sole cause. Political hostility was responsible for the migration of the hundred thousand United Empire Loyalists from the United States chiefly to Canada, and after the American Civil War large numbers of confederate refugees fled to countries outside the United States. The great flight of White Russians from Russia was due to political dissidence, and many thousands of Irish migrated

¹ See Oxford Pamphlet, No. 5, '*Race*' in *Europe*, by Julian Huxley.

to the United States of America owing to their hostility to the existing régime in their native Ireland. Other refugee movements have been due to economic conditions, of which an outstanding instance was the Irish migration to America during and after the great potato famine of 1845-7.

Nationalism

Nationalism, racial and economic, was not unknown before the Great War. Evidence of the former is found in laws governing alien immigration, in Great Britain, the Aliens Act of 1905. The aim, now so widespread, of racial purity within national boundaries, seems to have been adopted as a deliberate policy for the first time by the leaders of the Young Turk movement from the time of their earliest access to power. Economic nationalism resulted in what were commonly known as 'protective' tariffs which became fairly general in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The Great War gave great stimulus to these nationalisms all over the world. Whereas before the War travel between country and country was remarkably easy, after its close obstructions of every kind tended to be placed in the path of the would-be traveller. Rules as to passport and visa, currency and police regulations often combine to discourage ordinary travellers. But discouragement of movement since the War is not confined to the human being. It is also applied to the movements of goods. The doctrine of 'autarky', justified in the eyes of its supporters by the experiences of the War, has materially affected normal international trade.

Every country now attempts so to regulate its economic production that in case of war it would not be materially affected by blockade. By systems of tariff and quota it reduces to the minimum the importation of foreign goods.¹

This intensification of nationalist feeling both in the racial and in the economic sphere has put a stop to those movements of population which were normal in pre-War days. For many years before the War there was an annual exodus of hundreds of thousands from Europe to lands across the oceans. These people, though not classed as refugees, were in fact spurred by adverse religious, political, or economic conditions in their countries of origin. It is probable that facility for emigration at that time prevented movements definitely refugee in character. The importance of the change is evident in the figures published in the annual I.L.O. *Year Books*. In 1933, for example, Europe actually showed an inward balance of migration, while in 1932 Poland, an area from which emigration before the War was enormous, had the small outward balance of 3,800, and this was only due to emigration to Palestine, backed by Jewish funds for reasons not purely economic.

We are thus living to-day in a world divided into 'racial' and economic compartments, to a considerable degree watertight. The system is not confined to those countries which are highly developed and full of population. It includes certain countries with ample territory in need of development. Even

¹ See Oxford Pamphlet, No. 4, *Economic Self-sufficiency*, by A. G. Fisher.

in these countries, as a general rule, immigration is discouraged, with the object of maintaining 'racial' purity uncontaminated, or in the determination to avoid the possible formation of an alien minority or, in some cases, in the fear that admission of immigrants may affect the standard of life of the existing population.

Post-War Movements

During and immediately after the War there were four important racial refugee movements, which may now be regarded as definitely settled. They were those of the Armenians, the Greeks, the Bulgars, and the Turks. Of these the first three engaged the attention and benefited from the activity of the League of Nations, which in those early days of general support was peculiarly fitted to take charge of the international refugee problem.

Armenian Movement

Dr. Nansen was the first League High Commissioner in charge of refugee work, and though the principles adopted by the League itself confined its activities to political and juridical protection, and precluded any humanitarian effort, its agent, Dr. Nansen, considered himself bound by no such restrictions, and spent himself in the effort not only to provide juridical and political protection but also to relieve the sufferings of the unfortunate refugees in his charge. It was largely due to his efforts that many Armenians were settled in the Erivan Republic, and to those of himself and his successors that the hundred thousand remaining as homeless wanderers in Syria and the Lebanon have been

satisfactorily settled. No Armenian problem exists at the moment. A large number are finally settled in France, where the second generation is automatically naturalized. A smaller number are settled, though not with equal security, in Greece, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Altogether in Europe and the Near East, excluding the Erivan Republic, there are some 215,000 Armenians who were refugees, but who may now be regarded as settled.

Greek Movement

From ancient times there had been a Greek element in Asia Minor, which grew and prospered under the Turkish régime, and provided the Sultanate with political and economic experts. During and after the Great War the sympathies of the Greeks of Asia Minor were with the Allies, and it was to be expected that the Nationalist Government of Mustafa Kemal Pasha, when victorious in the Graeco-Turkish war which ended with the sack of Smyrna in 1922, would demand the exclusion of the Greek population from Asia Minor. This was effected by the Convention of Lausanne in the following year.¹ It was agreed that the Greeks of Asia Minor should be exchanged for the Turks in Greece, and Greece was faced with the problem of provision for 1,300,000 new nationals, including those who migrated from Bulgaria, with which State a similar agreement was concluded. Settlement was effected by a Commission under the auspices and direction of the League of Nations. It could have been successful in no other way. The settlement was on the

¹ See Oxford Pamphlet, No. 9, *Turkey, Greece, and the Eastern Mediterranean*, by G. F. Hudson.

whole highly satisfactory, and the problem of the Greek refugee no longer exists. Indeed, the Greek population of refugee origin is an element of strength and of prosperity to the Greek State.

Bulgarian Movement

The experience of Bulgaria resembled that of Greece, though the number of refugees was much smaller. They numbered about a quarter of a million, and came not only in consequence of the exchange with Greece, but also from Rumania, Yugoslavia, and Turkey. In this case also settlement was under the auspices of the League, which appointed a Commissioner for the purpose. As in the case of the Greek settlement, the expense was met from an international loan, sponsored by the League of Nations.

Turkish Movement

The transfer of Turkish populations from outside into Turkey was also on a large scale, but was organized by the Turkish Government without assistance from the League. Some 400,000 came from Greek territory alone. The policy adopted by the Turkish Government contemplates the immigration to Turkey of all Turkish-speaking inhabitants in adjacent countries except Thrace, and that Government announced in June 1938 that the completion of the plan would mean that a million Turks from outside Turkey had been admitted and settled in the country.

Russian Movement

A further and very important movement of

refugees occurred after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the consequent civil wars in Russia. Opinions differ widely as to the numbers involved, but recent careful examination suggests that there were over a million so-called 'White' Russian refugees, but that previous estimates of two or even three millions were exaggerated. These refugees scattered all over the world. They were welcomed in the Slav States, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, and in Czechoslovakia. In these three countries they were treated with remarkable generosity. In Czechoslovakia President Masaryk and Dr. Beneš, both of whom had experienced the misfortunes of refugee status, adopted the policy known as *Action Russe*, under which Russian refugee professors, students, and agriculturists were invited to the country and maintained while there resident. Russian universities, secondary, high, and technical schools, and agricultural colleges were organized, and efforts made to raise the educational and technical standards of the refugees, in the expectation that the skill acquired would be useful on their return to Russia when conditions in that country became, as Dr. Masaryk was convinced they would become, more normal. In common with many other European statesmen he was under the mistaken impression that the Bolshevik experiment would prove to be a temporary interlude in Russian history.

France also received and still affords asylum to a very large number of Russian refugees, who are gradually becoming assimilated. There is, however, scarcely a civilized country in the world where Russian refugees cannot be found. In most coun-

tries they are gradually becoming absorbed, but there is one group, that in the Far East, in China and Manchukuo, whose present condition is precarious and whose future uncertain. Absorption in the native population is impossible. Assimilation with the foreign population resident in the large towns was in progress until the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and of China. Under the policy adopted by the Japanese the Russian refugee has no prospects, and the only remedy for the unsatisfactory conditions under which he suffers is that he should be transferred to some other country which offers security and opportunity to the refugee to earn his living. Some ninety thousand persons are affected in this group.

The League and the Refugees

The connexion of the League of Nations with refugee questions began with the appointment of Dr. Nansen as High Commissioner for Russian refugees in September 1921. He was allowed much liberty of action, subject always to the consideration that the League should not be involved in expense. His duties were to define the status of refugees, to secure their repatriation or their employment outside Russia, and to co-ordinate measures for their assistance. The sole financial assistance given by the League in the year 1922 was a grant of £4,000 for the administrative expenses of the central office. The League was fortunate in its High Commissioner. The story is too long for record in this pamphlet, but has been told at length elsewhere. Dr. Nansen began with the dispersion of the Russian

refugees from Constantinople, where in 1922 there were 35,000, though the city was already congested by the presence of 75,000 Turkish and 155,000 Greek refugees, and the object was achieved at incredibly low cost. The care of other refugees in the Near East, Armenian, Greek, Bulgar, was added to Dr. Nansen's duties in 1922 and 1923.

The Nansen Passport

One of the initial difficulties which confronted Dr. Nansen was the fact that the refugees had no passports or other valid documents to establish nationality and so to facilitate travel. Indeed, the mass of the Russian refugees were stateless people, as were the Armenian refugees. One of his first tasks was therefore to create a system of identity documents which might serve the purpose of a passport, and at a conference in July 1922 he secured the agreement of fifty-one nations to the adoption and recognition of the identity certificate known as the Nansen passport, the first international certificate of the kind ever issued.

Conventions of 1933 and 1938

An ordinary traveller, provided with passport and visa, is entitled to the services of representatives of his government in those foreign countries which he may visit. He is also entitled to the benefit of legal protection by the courts and the police of those countries. These privileges arise out of his status as a national of his country of origin. The stateless refugee can claim none of these privileges, and the next duty of the League's High Commissioner was

to induce governments to accord to refugees present in their territory at least some of the more important advantages of this kind enjoyed by the ordinary traveller, or by the foreign resident in their country. This object was attained. After a series of Agreements, a Convention was concluded at Geneva in 1933, and accepted by nine States, which conferred on stateless refugees under the protection of the League of Nations certain elementary civil rights enjoyed by ordinary foreign nationals travelling or resident in their territories. The importance of this document lies in its character. It is a formal treaty, and should the League of Nations disappear and with it the political and juridical protection of those classes of refugee with which it deals, the rights of the refugees secured by the Convention would persist. A similar Convention, to which seven governments have acceded, was concluded in 1938 in favour of refugees coming from Germany.

Importance of League Protection

Although the League has consistently disclaimed any responsibility for humanitarian work among refugees, its protection and interest have been of the first importance. The action of the League of Nations in connexion with the settlement of Greek and Bulgarian refugees has already been noted. Had it not been for the support of the League, the funds necessary for those settlements could not have been raised. Nor is it conceivable that the Greek and Bulgarian Governments would have accepted arrangements which in fact amounted to the creation of autonomous bodies within their

States, with powers in practice autocratic, had these bodies not been subordinate to a powerful international organization of which Greece and Bulgaria were themselves members.

The High Commissioner

Under the control of the League of Nations the High Commissioner has his representatives in many countries where refugees have settled temporarily or permanently, and though they have no official position, except in France, they are of great help to the refugee in his dealings with the officials of the Government. The High Commissioner himself is in a position to negotiate with and to influence the policy of governments, and the Conventions of 1933 and 1938 must be attributed to the President of the Nansen International Office (the successor of Dr. Nansen), and to the League High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany respectively.

The office of the High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany was created in 1933, when the rise of Nazi power resulted in the flight of oppressed Jews and political opponents of the régime of that country. At that time Germany was a member of the League, and it was feared that if the protection of German refugees was committed to the President of the Nansen International Office, whose expenses were met from the League budget to which Germany herself contributed, antagonism would result. A compromise was therefore effected by the appointment of a High Commissioner, the expenses of whose office should be defrayed entirely

from private or other sources, no contribution being made by the League. It was also laid down that the High Commissioner should report, not to the Council of the League, but to his own Governing Body. Germany subsequently resigned from the League, and from 1 January 1939 the offices of President of the Nansen International Office and of High Commissioner for Refugees from Germany were combined in one office, that of High Commissioner for Refugees, to which Sir Herbert Emerson was appointed. Its head-quarters are in London.

Limitation of League Protection

It should always be remembered that the League of Nations deals, not with all refugees, but with certain classes only. The Russians, Armenians, Assyrians, and Saarlanders are under its protection, as also are refugees originating from Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia. The League, however, affords no protection to Italian, Spanish, or Portuguese refugees, nor does it deal with refugees from Abyssinia, or Chinese refugees in or from China. Frequent attempts have been made to interest the League in refugees as such, irrespective of origin, but these efforts have been unsuccessful.

The Intergovernmental Committee

There is another international organization which is interested in refugees from Greater Germany and Czechoslovakia. In July 1938 President Roosevelt called together a Conference at Evian to consider the problem of these refugees from central Europe. The meeting was attended by representa-

tives of thirty-one governments, and it resulted in the constitution of a permanent Intergovernmental Committee with head-quarters in London. This Committee appointed a 'director of authority', whose duties were described as follows: 'he shall undertake negotiations to improve the present conditions of exodus and to replace them by conditions of orderly emigration. He shall approach the Governments of the countries of refuge and settlement with a view to developing opportunities for permanent settlement.' The first director was Mr. George Rublee of Washington. On his resignation Sir Herbert Emerson, League High Commissioner, was appointed director. The liaison between the work of the League and that of the Intergovernmental Committee in connexion with refugees from central Europe is thus complete.

The Central European Movement

The story of the persecution of the Jew and of the so-called 'non-Aryan' in Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia since its annexation is one of the saddest pages of history. The theory of 'racial' purity was one of the planks of the National-Socialist party even before the assumption of power by Adolf Hitler in January 1933, and the application of the principle implied the elimination of the Jewish element in the population of the Reich. This elimination was effected in part by the application of legal provisions, in part by administrative action, even where such action was not in accordance with any formal law or decree of the Government. The Jew or 'non-Aryan' had in such cases no remedy,

for the Courts in practice refused to extend their protection to a Jew whose opponent did not suffer from 'racial' disability.

The original laws which aimed at the elimination of the Jew were extraordinarily harsh, and later laws have become progressively more severe. The first decree issued under the Reich Nationality Law in 1935 disfranchised those defined as Jews, who included all persons with three, and the large majority of those with two, Jewish grandparents. They were debarred from being officials, State lawyers, or doctors; they were excluded from professional participation in literature, the stage, the cinema, broadcasting, music, or painting; they were not permitted to render labour or military service. The Law for the Protection of German Blood, passed the same year, invaded the domestic sphere and limited the classes with whom persons with varying proportion of Jewish blood might intermarry. Later decrees intensified the persecution. Jews were banned from universities and schools, and a campaign against the Jew in industry and trade began in 1935 which resulted in the ultimate elimination of all Jewish concerns, Jews being driven out of one business after another. Even licences for petty trading were withdrawn in 1937 and a successful campaign for the suppression of 'non-Aryan' banking and stockbroking businesses was in progress. To-day Jewish participation in commerce and industry has disappeared. By the spring of this year (1939) the liquidation of Jewish business was complete, and out of 402,000 Jews still remaining in Greater Germany, excluding the Sudetenland, only

5,500 had the right to employment and only 3,280 were actually employed.

Objects of Nazi Policy

The deliberate and expressed object of Nazi policy in regard to Jews and 'non-Aryans' is to render life in Germany impossible for them and to compel them to emigrate. The withdrawal of means of livelihood has been accompanied by persecution and humiliation of every kind, not even children being exempted from maltreatment. There is no need here to record details which have been published not only in the daily press but in numerous more permanent publications. Maltreatment culminated in the savage and disgraceful pogrom of November 1938, which followed the assassination of vom Rath, a member of the German diplomatic staff at Paris, by a Polish Jew. In revenge for that crime the Reich Government imposed a fine of a milliard marks on the innocent Jewish community of Germany. Confiscation of Jewish property by various methods had been one of the items of policy from the start. It culminated in this unjustifiable imposition. Every possible step had been taken to attain the object of Nazi policy. The means of livelihood and accumulated resources of the Jews had been taken from them. The amenities of cultural and social life had been withdrawn, and no alternative remained for the Jew save to escape from Germany as best he could.

Jewish Plan of Emigration

Flight of refugees from Germany began in 1933 and continues to-day. In the earlier years the Jew-

ish organizations succeeded in controlling the emigration to some extent, so that at any given time the number of refugees in countries of temporary refuge who awaited permanent settlement elsewhere were only some 30,000. They had also formulated a plan contemplating methodical emigration of about 25,000 Jews each year, and had arranged to finance a movement of that size. This would have removed from Germany within a limited period all those fit for settlement in new environments. The plan was upset by the annexation of Austria in March 1938. The ferocity of the consequent persecution caused a grave and sudden increase of efforts to escape and thus placed heavy additional burdens on Jewish charity and dislocated the financial arrangements for the execution of the plan. The number of illegal entrants into adjacent countries increased largely and that of refugees in countries of temporary refuge rose from 30,000 to over 100,000, notwithstanding closure of frontiers and stringent measures to prevent entry. This action was inevitable, but meant cruel suffering for those turned back into Germany.

In October 1938 came the annexation of Sudetenland, followed in March 1939 by the occupation of Czechoslovakia. Both the size and the area of the problem were thus again increased. Several thousand refugees from Germany who had escaped into Czechoslovakia were added to the number of those whose safety could only be secured by flight. In addition there were many thousands both of Germans and of Czechs who had been loyal subjects of the Czechoslovak Government in its resistance to pressure from the Government of the Reich who

were marked men and whose only safety lay in escape from the country. The local Jewish community in Sudetenland also was subjected to that persecution from which their fellows in Germany had suffered for more than five years.

Numbers

In a recent broadcast Sir Herbert Emerson, League High Commissioner for Refugees, stated that, between 1933 and the end of 1938, refugees who had left Germany and Austria numbered 350,000. He continued: 'Even so, in February of this year there were still 600,000 persons who came within the Nuremberg laws and of these 400,000 will have to be evacuated. They are not all Jews by religion. On the contrary, about one-third of them are Christians. If there is serious persecution of the Jews in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia, the total number to be dealt with will be more than three-quarters of a million.' This may be taken as the most authoritative statement of the size of the 'racial' problem. There must, however, be added those groups, whose numbers are unknown, which are bound to leave Nazi territory for political or for religious reasons. It is true that both the political leaders and the Churches discourage emigration, on the ground that the existence of any strong current might lead to intensified persecution of those who remain behind, and it is remarkable how small is the number of political refugees, considering the strength of the Social Democratic Party and of the Trade Unions before the Nazi revolution of 1933. Refugees on religious grounds are becoming more

numerous, and a recent letter from the Vatican estimated the number of Catholics (chiefly it is true 'non-Aryans') who must leave Greater Germany as 200,000.

Method of Emigration

Jewish organizations and, to a smaller extent, Christian organizations have been active in promoting emigration of refugees to countries of final settlement, chiefly by the method of infiltration. The countries which have been most willing to receive refugees have been the United States of America, Palestine, the Argentine Republic, Brazil, and China. With the exception of the United States, where immigration is regulated by a quota, and of China, the countries of immigration have now taken measures to reduce admission of refugees. No country is likely to welcome alien immigrants who have been deprived of all their property and are turned out into the world as paupers. It is indeed remarkable that openings have been found in foreign countries for over 150,000 under the conditions in which emigration is now permitted.

Palestine is a particular case. The reason for restriction of immigration there is political rather than economic, and the quota at the present time is largely, if not entirely, filled by illegal immigrants, forwarded by organizations which specialize in illicit entry. This fact increases the difficulties of the Zionist authorities, who have large numbers of trained pioneers waiting for entry, but whose admission is prevented by the traffic in illicit immigrants.

China also is a particular case. Some ten thousand

Jewish refugees from central Europe have sought asylum in the Treaty Ports, the large majority in Shanghai. They are dependent on charitable assistance and have imposed an intolerable burden on local Jewish philanthropy. Their future is exceedingly unpromising.

Australia is taking 5,000 selected refugees each year for three years. Canada has agreed to admit about 400 families from Czechoslovakia. These are agriculturists and artisans and will be settled on the Peace River with financial assistance from the sum of £4 millions which was given to the Czechoslovak Government by Great Britain as a free gift.

Countries of Temporary Refuge

The process of selection and of obtaining permission to admit a refugee to a country of settlement is long and difficult. In view of the urgency to remove refugees from Germany, where conditions have become quite intolerable, several countries, including Great Britain, afford temporary asylum to a limited number, on condition that the refugees admitted shall ultimately emigrate overseas. France, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and Great Britain are the chief countries of temporary refuge, and to a smaller degree Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. Spain, which was an important country of refuge, has ceased to act in that capacity. No official statistics of admission are published, but it is certain that the total of those who have escaped to these countries far exceeds 100,000. In Great Britain, as in some other countries, a refugee is admitted only if guarantees are provided against

him becoming a charge on public funds and that finance for his ultimate emigration will be forthcoming when required. A further general condition prevents acceptance of employment, paid or unpaid, by the refugee while resident in the country. Until recent months immigration was selective and individual. Since the November pogrom a system has been introduced under which children can be admitted on a block visa for a specified number, and some 7,000 children have been or are being admitted in this way. A similar method has been employed for the immigration of a total of 3,500 men, who are guaranteed by Jewish organizations and are housed in camp at Richborough.

New Nazi Plan for Jews

A decree was announced in Berlin on 6 July which to some extent changes the position of the Jew in Germany. Its object is to encourage emigration. A 'Reich Jewish Association' has been formed, to which every Jew in Germany must adhere, and which replaces every existing organization dealing with Jewish education and welfare. The Association is entrusted with the provision of schools, universities, and polytechnics, if these are necessary to facilitate emigration. Compulsory attendance of all Jewish children at these schools is decreed. The Association is also responsible for welfare work and for preventing Jews becoming a public charge.

The object of the Association is not to make life easier for Jews in Germany but to facilitate their emigration. As is reported in *The Times* of 7 July, 'it is pointed out that the Jews themselves must

establish, from the current income of the Association and from the special sums which they will receive upon the emigration of Jews, an office which shall be sufficient at all times to support Jews in Germany with Jewish money, and to enable poor Jews to emigrate'.

Recent information from Germany indicates that the position of the Jew has been relieved in certain respects. Between 4,000 and 5,000 young Jews have obtained work on the roads and fortifications, and a number of Jewish doctors and surgeons are being retained in the country, so that they may form a medical reserve in case of war. They are permitted to practise among Jews only. But the principles of National Socialism are unchanged. To quote again from *The Times* of 7 July: 'The aim of National Socialism remains that of removing every single Jew from the Reich.'

Italian Refugees

Refugees from Italy are purely political and the mass is found in France. They do not constitute a grave international problem, as do the refugees from central Europe. Including dependants they probably number between 30,000 and 40,000. As there are some 900,000 Italians in France, the political refugee from Italy is certain to meet friends and will probably find relatives, and experiences little difficulty in maintaining himself and his family.

The League of Nations provides no political or juridical protection for these refugees. They have asked for such protection on several occasions, but without success.

Spanish Refugees

The end of the Civil War in Spain resulted in a flood of refugees into France, in number in excess of 400,000. The French Government organized camps for their reception. At the beginning there was naturally much confusion, and conditions, especially sanitary conditions, were in places unsatisfactory. The organization, which is costing France millions of francs a day, now works smoothly. The great majority of the refugees will probably be repatriated, and repatriation has begun, but is proceeding very slowly. There will be a residue, estimated at 40,000, who believe that their lives would be in danger were they to return to a Nationalist Spain, and for them some arrangement must be made. About one thousand have already emigrated to Chile and some hundreds to Mexico and other countries, and it is expected that Mexico will provide asylum for the bulk of the remainder of this group.

France has shown great liberality in her treatment of refugees generally. She has maintained the legal right of asylum for those suffering from religious and political persecution, and reaffirmed the principle in a decree of 2 May 1938. The reception of Spanish refugee children was organized by the *Confédération Générale de Travail*, and their treatment was quite remarkable. Very large numbers were temporarily adopted and maintained by households of the working class, and the Trade Unions made arrangements for technical education and apprenticeship for the elder boys.

By her geographical position France has been

particularly liable to influxes of refugees. She now has over 600,000 from various countries within her borders, and it is unjust that the financial and organizational liability for their maintenance should fall entirely on France as it does at present.

Chinese Refugees

The invasion of China by Japan and the occupation of large areas of the country have resulted in colossal movements of refugees. The population of the occupied territory is moving and has moved by the million, and it is reported that not less than twelve million refugees have entered the three western Provinces of Yunnan, Kweichow, and Szechuan alone. The sufferings attendant on a trek of this magnitude have been indescribable. The Chinese National Government has done all in its power to relieve suffering and to provide means of settlement in the undeveloped but fertile western territories, and is reported to have spent one thousand million dollars in relief and settlement expenditure. Much help has also been received from the charitable of many nations and notably from the Chinese resident outside China, but the movement has been so stupendous that no imaginable sum would be adequate to finance it.

Industries, schools, and universities have taken part in this great migration, and the one redeeming feature is found in the certainty that, with the rapid improvement of means of communication which is in progress, and the consequent development of a rich area which has hitherto lain fallow, the future of those great Provinces is assured. It

may well be that the cultural, industrial, and political centre of China has moved permanently from her Eastern to her Western Provinces.

Refugee Movements a Political Problem

The civilized world is to-day faced with refugee movements which constitute for all civilized countries a major political problem. It is too late to use the argument that the treatment of the Jew in Germany is Germany's affair; that argument has been used by official spokesmen of the National-Socialist State, even while the Government of that State was taking action which forced the refugee to enter a neighbouring country, and there presented that country with a political problem. The fact that it is a political problem which concerns civilized governments was recognized by those governments when they accepted President Roosevelt's invitation to take part in the Evian deliberations. The problem has been created, in so far as the central European refugees are concerned, by the medieval policy adopted by the government of Adolf Hitler. Its solution has been rendered exceedingly difficult by the prevalent 'racial' and economic nationalism for whose existence all governments are responsible.

Responsibility of Governments

The large majority of civilized governments have accepted a measure of responsibility for solution of the problem by participation in the Evian Committee and the Intergovernmental Committee which followed it. They have, however, made little headway in devising and undertaking

measures for its solution. They have adopted one principle which effectively prevents drastic or complete measures for solution, in that the finance necessary for relief and for settlement has hitherto been regarded as an obligation on the private organizations. Enormous sums have been subscribed for these objects. On 5 July the Earl of Lytton stated in the House of Lords that altogether, in a few years, £5,000,000 had been raised through private charity in this country. This money has already been spent or earmarked. Perhaps 200,000 refugees have been settled, and among them those who succeeded in escaping in early years, when they were able to bring out some of their capital with them. According to Sir Herbert Emerson there are still at least 400,000 who must be evacuated, and the number may prove to be three-quarters of a million. In addition there are well over 100,000 in countries of 'temporary refuge'. It is clear that the problem is of such magnitude as to be entirely outside the financial capacity of the private organization, however liberally supported by private charity. Nor can it be expected that private charity will continue to provide sums so considerable as those raised by special effort in the past few years. It is clear that the first requisite towards a solution of the problem is recognition by governments that they must provide the major portion of its cost.

Methods of Settlement

Solution of the problem implies that the refugee shall be settled in a country of permanent refuge. Whether this is effected by infiltration or by mass

settlement, it inevitably takes time. The immediate urgency is to get the refugee out of the country, where he is subject to maltreatment and consequent demoralization, and to remove him as soon as possible. Existing methods are inadequate for the purpose. This fact has been recognized both in Great Britain and in Holland, and the system of block visas has been used in certain particular cases. This system should be extended, and entry rendered less difficult. Adequate provision of this kind would remove the conditions which now compel the refugee to resort to illegal entry. But such an extension will demand the provision of camps of refuge for those admitted, of the type already working at Richborough. The cost of provision of the camps and of the maintenance of the refugees in them would inevitably be a public charge, for private charity is insufficient to meet that cost.

In the Intergovernmental Committee the machinery exists for international agreement as to the numbers which each country would take for temporary refuge. That Committee is in diplomatic relations with the Nazi Government, and could make efforts to secure more reasonable treatment of the undesired population remaining in Germany in return for arrangements ensuring more rapid emigration.

Hitherto the common method of settlement was by infiltration. This was adequate and desirable when the problem was limited to the refugee from Germany proper. It has the advantage that it facilitates assimilation. Though this method will

doubtless continue, it is no longer adequate. The numbers affected have become so large that the solution by settlement by infiltration requires in addition settlement by groups. This fact has been recognized, and the investigation of the possibilities of British Guiana, of San Domingo, and of Mindanao (Philippines) has been undertaken. The settlement of refugees from Czechoslovakia on the Peace River in Canada has already been mentioned.

Mass settlement requires not only an area in which to settle, but expert supervision of settlement and preliminary training of the settler. The experience of Jewish settlement in Palestine has established that success can be commanded, even in an area apparently unsuitable, if care is taken to fulfil these conditions. It also demands adequate finance, which in the case of the refugees from central Europe implies at least a guarantee by governments.

Immigration and Population

There are several Western European countries where the trend of population statistics is causing anxiety. In London, for example, on 7 July there was a meeting of headmasters of public schools to consider the problem caused by the decrease in the number of boys of school-going age, and it is notorious that the school population is decreasing. In France again the position is even more acute. Under these circumstances the attitude of these and of other countries, whose position is very similar, in refusing to consider themselves as countries of ultimate settlement of selected refugees is un-

intelligible. It would be sound policy to accept as many children as possible with the deliberate intention of bringing them up and educating them and ultimately naturalizing them citizens of the country which adopts them, to fill to some extent the gap caused by the diminishing birth-rate. It is difficult to understand a policy which admits refugee children, provides the necessary expense for their education, and demands that the finished product should be exported at the age of eighteen. There is no recorded case of a country which suffered by the assimilation of a refugee immigrant population. To take one example, the welcome extended by France to Russian and Armenian refugees has been repaid by the work done by them in the heavy industries.

Conclusion

Private charity has responded nobly to the humanitarian claims presented by the refugee problem of the last few years. There is still ample scope for private effort. But the essence of the problem is political, and private effort is impotent conclusively to deal with it. The problem requires the active consideration of governments. Unless governments are prepared to regard it as a major political disturbance, whose reactions affect the well-being of each civilized state and of the comity of civilized nations, no radical solution can be expected, and the private energy displayed will largely be wasted.

DATE DUE SLIP

Due Ruth MAR 15 '38

MAR 15 RETURN

ETS
IRS

nal topics
vers, and
1.

ZIMMERN.

AMPF, by

SAILLES,

RSON.

by R. R.

RANEAN,

N.

SEP 21 1979

D 411 098 NO-13
SIMPSON JOHN HOPE SIR 1868-
THE REFUGEE QUESTION

39359860 HSS



000006208953

D 411 098 no.13
Simpson, John Hope, Sir, 1868-.
The refugee question.

0265022X MAIN

OXFORD PAMPHLETS ON WORLD AFFAIRS

A SERIES of short accounts of current international topics written by expert historians, economists, lawyers, and scientists. Average length 32 pages, price 3d. each.

1. THE PROSPECTS OF CIVILIZATION, by SIR ALFRED ZIMMERN.
2. THE BRITISH EMPIRE, by H. V. HODSON.
3. HERR HITLER'S SELF-DISCLOSURE IN *MEIN KAMPF*, by R. C. K. ENSOR.
4. ECONOMIC SELF-SUFFICIENCY, by A. G. B. FISHER.
5. 'RACE' IN EUROPE, by JULIAN HUXLEY.
6. THE FOURTEEN POINTS AND THE TREATY OF VERSAILLES, by G. M. GATHORNE-HARDY.
7. COLONIES AND RAW MATERIALS, by H. D. HENDERSON.

Published August 1939

8. 'LIVING SPACE' AND POPULATION PROBLEMS, by R. R. KUCZYNSKI.
9. TURKEY, GREECE, AND THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN, by G. F. HUDSON.
10. THE DANUBIAN BASIN, by C. A. MACARTNEY.
11. THE DUAL POLICY, by SIR ARTHUR SALTER, M.P.
12. ENCIRCLEMENT, by J. L. BRIERLY.
13. THE REFUGEE QUESTION, by SIR JOHN HOPE SIMPSON.

Other Pamphlets are in active preparation

SEP 21 1979

D 411 098 NO-13

SIMPSON JOHN HOPE SIR 1868-
THE REFUGEE QUESTION

39359860 HSS



000006208953

D 411 098 no.13

Simpson, John Hope, Sir, 1868-.
The refugee question.

0265022X MAIN

A52970